

Application Number:	24/00011/HOUS
Location:	7 Greenwich Close Rochdale OL11 5JN
Proposal:	Single storey side/rear extension - retrospective
Applicant:	M Muther
Case Officer:	Chelsea Petrillo
DETERMINATION DATE 11.03.2024	EXT OF TIME
RECOMMENDATION:	Refuse

DELEGATION	Applicant a Council Member or officer?	NO
	Contrary to previous decision?	NO
	Called in or Planning Panel objection?	NO

COMMENTS	Planning Panel comments received?	NO
	Neighbour comments received?	NO

CONDITIONS	Pre-commencement conditions proposed?	NO
	Pre-commencement conditions agreed (or notification period expired)?	N/A

Location

7 Greenwich Close is a two-storey detached residential property located in the Bamford ward of Rochdale to which it benefits from substantial rear garden space, off-road parking and an attached garage.

The property is sited between nos.5 and 9 Greenwich Close and the rear curtilage is bounded by substantial vegetation which provides a degree of screening between the application property and no.49 Bamford Way to the rear.

Description of Proposal

Retrospective permission is sought for a flat roof single storey extension presenting an unorthodox layout wrapping around both the rear and south side elevation. The extension is built up against the common boundary shared with no.9 as well as both the existing rear conservatory and previously approved single storey side extension and hosts a gym and store.

Previous permission to regularize the development was sought and refused to which it presented a marginally larger scale than that proposed under this application.

Relevant History

15/01370/HOUS Two storey side extension and single storey side extension
Granted January 2016

23/00944/HOUS Single-storey side and rear extension – Retrospective

Refused October 2023

1. By virtue of its design, scale, siting and materiality, the retrospective extension has not been constructed sympathetic to the existing dwelling and would have an unacceptable impact upon the built form and existing visual amenity. The extension would be discordant to the character of the existing building and appear as a disproportionate and incongruous addition. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework

Township/Member comments

None Applicable

Consultee responses

None Applicable

Representations

Letters of notification were sent to surrounding properties. No public comments were received

Policy

National

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

Local

Saved Rochdale Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006:
G/D/1 Defined Urban Area

Adopted Rochdale Core Strategy (CS) 2016:

The Rochdale Core Strategy was adopted on 19th October 2016. The following policies are relevant:

P3	Improving Design of New Development
DM1	General Development Requirements
T2	Improving Accessibility
Appendix 5	Schedule of Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD): Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' (2016).

Amendments

None Applicable

Assessment

Design: DM1 and P3

Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states "Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities". Further to this policy DM1 requires all development proposals to demonstrate that they *(a) are of high quality design and take the opportunity to enhance the quality of the area;*

The previous application (23/00944/HOUS) refused the initial attempt at retrospective permission by virtue of the overall design of the scheme which was considered unsympathetic to the existing dwellinghouse whilst presenting an incongruous addition which would have an unacceptable impact to the built form of the host dwelling.

The revised application is not considered to wholly overcome previous concerns and would present similar refusal reasons. Where it is acknowledged the extension has been reduced from an overall floor space from 40.4m² to 36.3m², the layout remains unorthodox in relation to the siting to the main dwellinghouse and would therefore remain an incongruous and disproportionate addition.

When viewed in isolation, the siting of the extension is not considered to impact upon the existing street scene or pose significant visual harm when viewed from the front elevation. Further to this, the dwelling lies within a cul-de-sac with the only through access facilitating the primary entry point to 49 Bamford Way located off a small side road. This, together with substantial vegetation running along the rear boundary, does not give rise to any concerns regarding visibility of the extension.

The property is detached therefore affords excess amenity space around the dwelling. Previously approved permission granted the existing side extension to which it retained a small space between the side elevation of the extension and the common boundary shared with no.9. The previous officers report raised concern to the extension being built along the common boundary which infilled the visual break between the application property and that adjacent, no.9 Greenwich Close and therefore compromised the detached nature of the dwellings. The new proposal fails to acknowledge this previous concern therefore remains unacceptable in this regard.

As existing, the roof form of the dwelling incorporates both pitched and hipped roof forms therefore to build an incongruously large extension with a flat roof at this scale raises concern to the overall form of the dwelling and would vastly compromise the visual amenity of the existing house.

The proposed material palette was previously regarded as unacceptable due to the discordant nature when assessed against the appearance and character of the main dwellinghouse including the grey breeze block wall along the common boundary. Limited details of the materials have been provided under the revised application with fenestration stated as "UPVC". It is noted that whilst no objection can be made to this given limited information have been provided, it is preferable for the detailings of the extension to match that on the main dwellinghouse.

The design of the proposal therefore remains unacceptable and does not accord with policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the SPD and the NPPF by virtue of its overall design and scale.

Amenity: DM1 and SPD

Protection of residential amenity is considered under policy DM1 of the Core Strategy to which it states that new development is expected to demonstrate that it is "compatible with surrounding land uses, both in terms of its impact upon those uses and the impact of the surrounding land uses upon the amenities of future residents / users"

The proposal remains acceptable when assessed in relation to surrounding properties and the amenity of the host dwelling itself and in accordance with Section 4 SPD Space Standards.

The proposal would not unduly impact on the amenity of the occupants of neighbouring properties in accordance with policies DM1, the SPD and the NPPF.

Recommendation: Refuse

1. By virtue of its design, scale and siting, the proposed development fails to rectify previous concerns and therefore remains unsympathetic and disproportionate to the form of the host dwelling. The development would seek to add an incongruous addition which would erode a visual break between the host property and that adjacent, no.9 Greenwich Close, therefore disrupting the detached nature of the dwellings. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1 and P3 of the adopted Rochdale Core Strategy, the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Guidelines and Standards for Residential Development' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Article 35 Statement

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application.

	Date	Officer
Report Completed	05.02.2024	Signed: CPetrillo
Authorisation	08.03.2024	Signed: TH

Notes for the Applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, the above decision relates to the following plans:

- Location Plan
- A2038/3 Proposed Site Plan and Ground Floor Plan
- A2038/4 Proposed Elevations

Report Author Chelsea Petrillo